

MADISON COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

P.O. Box 278 • Virginia City, Montana 59755 • Phone (406) 843-5250 • Fax (406) 843-5229

**MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2008**

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by President Ann Schwend at 6:09 p.m.

II. Roll Call

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Ann Schwend, Pat Bradley, Dorthy Davis, Kathy Looney, Dave Maddison, Donald Loyd, Eileen Pearce, Ed Ruppel, and Lane Adamson

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: John Lounsbury and Laurie Schmidt

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Charity Fechter and Jim Jarvis

STAFF MEMBERS ABSENT: Marilee Foreman Tucker

OTHERS PRESENT: Alex Zukowski, Justin Houser, Mike Ducennois, Bob Sumpster, Jean Sherman, and Kevin Germain

III. Minutes of the February 25, 2008 meeting

Page 11 - First paragraph, 6th line from the bottom, is an incomplete sentence. It should read "The ordinance could not take affect for 30 days."

Page 1 - Ann Schwend does not believe that she made the motion to accept the minutes. The tapes will be reviewed and correction made as appropriate.

Page 1 - Last sentence under "Site Description" is incomplete. It should read as it is in the staff report.

Page 16 - Last sentence under "Final Site Layout" uses "sighted" when it should be "sited."

<p>MOTION: to approve the February 25, 2008, minutes as corrected. Motion made by Kathy Looney and seconded by Dorothy Davis. Motion passed unanimously.</p>

IV. President's Comments

Anne Schwend had no comments.

V. Opportunity for Public Comment

There were no public comments.

VI. Public Hearings

President Ann Schwend opened the public hearing portion of the meeting at 6:15 p.m. by reading the public hearing purpose statement.

A. Preliminary Plat and Overall Development Plan – Yellowstone Mountain Club, The Settlement Planned Unit Development (Owner - by Morrison-Maierle)

Jim Jarvis gave an overview of the project and directed the Planning Board's attention to the Staff Report Findings. Bob Sumpter and Mike Ducennois with the Yellowstone Mountain Club and Justin Houser with Morrison-Maierle, Inc. responded to questions and provided additional information to the Planning Board and staff.

Site Description:

The Settlement PUD Subdivision is a 161-acre site located in the Big Sky area, 2½ miles southwest of Meadow Village. The site, accessed via Yellowstone Mountain Club Trail, Ousel Falls Road and MT Hwy 64, is centrally located within the 13,400-acre Yellowstone Mountain Club (YMC) holding. Legally the tract is described as a portion of the N ½ of Section 7 and the NW ¼ of Section 8, T7S, R3E, PMM Madison County. The irregularly shaped tract sits above the South Fork of the West Fork of the Gallatin River, on a south-facing hillside with slopes ranging from 4%-80%. An existing residence is located on Lot 7. The rugged terrain is characterized by fir and pine forests interspersed with small meadows and wetlands. Open-space will comprise 70 acres (44%) of the total acreage. Adjacent land uses are of a similar residential recreational nature (see attached Preliminary Plat).

Proposal:

1. The Settlement Planned Unit Development (PUD) Subdivision clusters proposed home and condominium sites on the western half of the parcel away from sensitive wetlands, riparian, and cultural resources located along the southern river corridor. Primary subdivision access will be provided by three direct approaches to Yellowstone Mountain Club Trail. Secondary emergency access is accomplished via an existing road easement located along the northern border of the subdivision. This emergency access directly connects the proposed condominium loop road with an existing adjacent subdivision road (Sandstone Road). New and existing community water and wastewater treatment facilities will be expanded and extended to serve the subdivision.

The proposed use areas are distributed as follows:

Use	Description	Acres	%
6 Residential, single-family homes	6 lots ranging from 4.55-25.14 acres in size	70.40 acres	44%
36 Residential condos	1 lot, 17.48 acres with 12 triplex units	17.48 acres	10%
Community open space	2 tracts, 5.28 & 64.78 acres	70.06 acres	44%
Common area	1 tract, 3.06 acres	3.06 acres	2%
	TOTAL	161 acres	100%

2. Amended Yellowstone Mountain Club Overall Development Plan (OPD) (2007 Updated Master Plan)

The YMC project is a gated residential/recreational community covered by a Master Plan last amended in 2003. A 2007 amended OPD (Master Plan) was submitted to document changes to proposed development locations. The Settlement PUD Subdivision is an example of one of these changes. The updated ODP/Master Plan Map identifies current and future development plans for the overall development. These changes support YMC's commitment to cluster development and maximizing open space (see attached Updated Master Plan Map, Figure 1F). The number of dwelling and rental units (864 and 100 respectively) remains unchanged.

Comments/Questions from the Board:

Planning staff clarified that the County-led traffic study referred to is in the works, and explained the right-turn lane for Ousel Falls Road.

Cultural resources report Pat asked how YMC is handling the finding that page 8 of their report considers the site significant. Mike DuCuennois stated that the plan avoids disturbing those areas. Jim asked why the additional study was done in 2007. Mike DuCuennois responded that the original study started with broad brush, and they wanted to tighten up the specific sites so that they could be avoided.

Wetlands and water on project, 404 permit Ann asked how much wetland area would be disturbed and how are they meeting the mitigation requirements. Justin Houser stated that the wetlands would be bridged so there would be no disturbed wetlands. Bob Sumpter stated that they would be in compliance as pile bridges are exempt under the 404 permit and desirable under the 310 permit. Mike DuCuennois stated they have put in their 310 application for bridges.

EPA mitigation from earlier violation Ann asked whether all of the mitigations were met for the old problems they had with EPA. Bob Sumpter stated that they are meeting their mitigation restoration plan, which is a 5 to 7 year process. They are in compliance with the consent decree, with the understanding that if a site fails they can do another site, though this would mean longer monitoring.

General Permit Bob Sumpter stated that the Army Corps of Engineers suggested that YMC apply for a general permit for the overall development instead of reviewing each individual permit for driveways and similar activities.

Board Discussion Points

Pat Bradley asked whether construction workers were now picking up after their lunch. Mr. Sumpter reported that their bear management plan addresses that issue.

Pat complimented Jim on the staff report. She is concerned that the effects on wildlife and habitat are not neutral toward the wildlife. It should be rated as "somewhat" negative or "piecemeal." It also is not necessarily neutral on other resources. She has some problems with the proposed deviations. Deviation A (standard lot line easement) is okay. Deviation B (lot depth to width ratio) is not appropriate. Deviation C (building site on a slope >25%) would set a precedence. Deviation D (AASHTO road standards) is okay.

Ann questioned how many structures there would actually be on slopes greater than 25%. Mike Ducennois responded that neither a whole unit nor a building envelope was entirely on a slope greater than 25%. There is a notation on the plat that site-specific geotechnical studies are required before building. Ann stated that it would be helpful to have something to better than a flat map to show what these would look like.

Pat and Kathy both commented that they enjoyed the cultural history.

Kathy questioned how avalanches are to be dealt with, especially with roads going through the area. Bob Sumpter responded that they generally have south-facing slopes, but some roads are subject to control where they need to minimize avalanche hazard. Mike DuCuennois noted that the YMC snow safety supervisor checks out the situation regularly and roads may be closed temporarily while the situation is controlled.

Public Comment

Bob Sumpter, representing the Yellowstone Mountain Club (YMC), commented that the staff report (based on January 2007 information) incorrectly placed the employee campus at the entrance to the YMC. With the Buck's transaction that took place last year those issues were resolved. Mr. Jarvis agreed to update the staff report accordingly. Mr. Sumpter then spoke to specific conditions that he questioned.

ODP-Specific Condition 1 requires a mutual aid agreement with the Gallatin Canyon Consolidation Rural Fire Department (GCCRFD). A group has been put together to look at public safety. At one time there were issues between YMC and GCCRFD, but things have gotten better. YMC considers the requirement for the agreement discriminatory in that they are forced to do an agreement with GCCRFD but others do not. In response to his question, Mr. Jarvis stated that this condition was not tied to the final plat, but remained an unresolved OPD level issue. Mr. Jarvis asked for recommendations from the Planning Board and the developer as to how to clarify this mutual aid relationship.

It appears, even without an agreement, YMC and the GCCRFD are providing mutual aid. Don Loyd commented that GCCRFD is a public entity. As a fire district they have mutual aid agreements with other districts, with specific protocols for dispatch to follow. The question is how to come to an agreement with a private company, such as YMC.

Ann noted that what the County is really looking for is evidence that mutual aid is being provided.

Bob Sumpter said he could provide information showing that the two fire departments are calling each other as standard protocol. Don noted there is active mutual aid between the departments, and cited some examples. Because of the way fire district boundaries are set, part of YMC is actually in the Gallatin response area.

Lane Adamson suggested that a memorandum of understanding would provide the needed evidence.

The Board then discussed rewording the condition to read "cooperation" rather than "agreement." Pat questioned whether this would stop plat approval. Jim asked what mechanism would be used to document a loose agreement. Ann commented that the mutual aid agreement was originally placed as a condition during the early phase of YMC's development. Don noted that the reason for it is related to public safety. A mutual aid agreement is there to get the resources rolling with dispatch orders. Bob Sumpter noted that YMC has an agreement with Madison County, and they are part of the enhanced 911; he felt it [mutual aid relationship] would evolve to take care of itself. Mike DuCuennois pointed out that four roadblocks to a mutual aid agreement have already been identified. Ann commented that this is public safety issue, especially with the possibility of a catastrophic fire. She felt it is important to have a protocol in place clearly defining who responds to what. Don was comfortable with mutual aid cooperation instead of agreement. The staff report will be changed to reflect the word "cooperation" rather than "agreement".

Dorothy Davis questioned whether the emergency management is taken care of. Bob Sumpter stated they have a contract with AMR.

ODP-Specific Condition #3 and comments from Gallatin County require YMC to participate with other developers to address traffic issues. Bob Sumpter stated for the record that they have no problem cooperating on traffic related issues, but that Gallatin County needs to recognize the support given by Moonlight, Dreamcatcher, Madison

County and YMC to the public bus entity. It bothers him that Gallatin County has commented about traffic but they do not put any money into the system. Gallatin County asks for conditions when they won't support the fundamental system. The bus company asked for \$50,000 from both Madison County and Gallatin County; Madison County agreed to fund \$30,000. Gallatin County funded nothing, although the users on the bus line all live in Gallatin County. He finds it hypocritical of them not to support public transit to Big Sky. He had intended to bring this up at the March 14 multi-county meeting.

Don agreed with Mr. Sumpter. Gallatin County does not even clear roads in the area. The Big Sky area is looked at as a revenue source, but no resources are provided to them.

ODP-Specific Conditions 4 and 5 require that subdivision-specific geotechnical assessments and evaluations of impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat be submitted with preliminary plat applications. Bob Sumpter feels that these should be tied to the final plat approval.

Dave Maddison questioned how the Planning Board can evaluate a subdivision without the information from the reports. Bob Sumpter noted that any hazards are noted on the plat after preliminary plat approval. He estimated that the preliminary plat application would be delayed by at least 8 months for the specific studies versus overall studies. Ann noted that they know in advance what studies are likely to be needed. Mike DuCuennois noted that the studies themselves may take anywhere from one month to 2 years. Pat noted that the studies are necessary when they are talking about building on 25% slopes. Bob Sumpter noted that the specific geotechnical studies have been submitted only twice, and that the wildlife studies are done annually.

Pat asked why it was necessary to build on a slope greater than 25%, especially since the site is adjacent to a landslide area. Justin Houser noted that the geotechnical information is in the application specifically because some building areas would be in areas greater than 25% slope. Ed Ruppel commented that the geotechnical report suggest there are serious problems. Water and sewer lines across an active landslide will break, which makes the situation worse when the fluid is added. The river is cutting off the toe of the landslide so there is nothing they can do to stabilize it. Their plan makes sure no water goes in, but a broken line will affect the fluid level. Bob Sumpter stated they hire geotechnical engineers to advise them so that they do not create a hazard. They are just asking for flexibility in the timing of the reports. The Planning Board did not support this proposed change to the staff report, and asked that the requested subdivision-specific information be submitted at the preliminary plat stage.

Proposed Findings of Fact:

The preliminary plat and amended ODP have been reviewed to determine compliance with the Montana Subdivision and Platting Act, Madison County Subdivision Regulations, and Madison County Comprehensive Plan/Growth Policy.

In accordance with state law, the Planning Office proposes the following Findings of Fact based on the local government review criteria as set forth in Section 76-3-608, MCA and the Madison County Subdivision Regulations.

- A. Application Completeness – Application is complete
- B. Public Interest Criteria

1. Effects on Agriculture – Not applicable
 2. Effects on Agricultural Water User Facilities – Not applicable
 3. Effects on Local Services – Neutral, no significant impacts. Many on-site private service facilities and cooperative agreements are in place. Impacts on roads, employee housing and local schools are being actively monitored. Potential property tax revenues greatly exceed costs to provide services.
 4. Effects on the Natural Environment – Neutral, no significant impacts. PUD design minimizes construction-related disturbance, while maximizing open space. Centralized water and sewer systems encourage operational efficiencies and minimize environmental impacts. An extensive stormwater management system is proposed to minimize erosion and maximize soil profile stability on steep slopes throughout the subdivision.
 5. Effects on Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat – Neutral, no significant impact. Wildlife distributions and habitat conditions continue to be monitored on an annual basis. The twelve 1999 wildlife management recommendations continue to effectively guide and shape development decisions.
 6. Effects on Public Health and Safety – Neutral, adverse impacts have been minimized. Wildfire and geotechnical impacts continue to be actively addressed through facility and program improvements. Traffic impacts are continually monitored.
 7. Effect on Other Resources in the County – Neutral, cultural resources associated with the subdivision have been thoroughly investigated and documented. Development has been located to minimize disturbance to archeological resources.
 8. Effects on the Local Economy – Positive
 9. Effects on Public Services Provided by Other Entities in the County – Neutral
- C. Legal and Physical Access – Positive. Legal access to the property already exists and will be physically improved by the property owner. Preliminary plat denotes easements and maintenance agreement.
- D. Parkland Dedication – Satisfied, ample open-space provided within PUD proposal.
- E. Requested Deviations to Design Standard

The developer has requested the following deviations from the county subdivision design standards to optimize placement of buildings and roads in support of the PUD.

Deviation A – Standard lot line easement – To improve construction efficiency and minimize landscape disturbance, utility and road easements have been pre-engineered into other rights-of-way within the development, negating the need for lot line easements as called out within the subdivision regulations. Staff findings: deviation warranted

Deviation B – Lot depth to width ratio – Lot 6, the condominium lot exceeds the 3:1 ratio. A 4.5:1 ratio is proposed to facilitate location of the condo units, improve construction and management efficiencies and minimize disturbance to the site. The design standards allow deviations for these purposes. Staff finding: deviation warranted

Deviation C – Steep slope building site – Several of the proposed building sites, defined by building envelopes, are located on slopes exceeding 25%. Per 76-3-505(1)(e), MCA such sites are prohibited unless hazards can be overcome by approved construction techniques. The developer states that hazards have been identified and overcome by instituting strict geotechnical and construction review requirements for each building site. These requirements are documented on the face of the plat. Staff finding: deviation acceptable

Deviation D – Road Standards – In support of the PUD objectives of clustering development and minimizing disturbance to the land the following deviations to the road standard are found to be warranted.

- a. Reduced width of road and utility right-of-way (40 feet versus 60 feet) for Lot 6.
- b. Eliminate secondary emergency access for Lots 3, 4 and 5.
- c. Replace cul-de-sac with hammerhead tee turnaround for access to specific condo units

Per Chapter IV-A (10-a) of the county subdivision regulations; subdivision roads shall meet the standards outlined in Table IV-1 of the subdivision regulations or those described in the current edition of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines. Whenever AASHTO guidelines are proposed a registered professional engineer must provide written justification and verification for their use. Within the subdivision application (page IV-12), the project engineer has confirmed that all subdivision roads will satisfy AASHTO guidelines. Also, refer to Condition # 14 of this report. The local fire chief has reviewed and accepted all proposed road specifications.

F. Substantial Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan/Growth Policy – Substantially complies with the Comprehensive Plan/Growth Policy

Conclusion:

With conditions, the proposed subdivision and Amended ODP will:

- (1) be in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations;
- (2) have an acceptable impact on each of the six public interest criteria, plus other resources in the County, the local economy, and public services provided by other entities in the County; and
- (3) be in substantial compliance with the County Comprehensive Plan/Growth Policy.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the staff analysis and proposed Findings of Fact, the Planning Board recommends preliminary plat approval of The Settlement PUD Subdivision and the Yellowstone Mountain Club Amended ODP (2007 Updated Master Plan), subject to the conditions listed below.

[Standard subdivision conditions]

1. Any and all adopted State and County requirements and standards which apply to this proposed subdivision must be met unless otherwise waived for cause by the governing body. *II-H and Chapter IV, MCSR 9/2006*

2. A notarized declaration of “Right to Farm” and “Emergency Services Information” (Appendix R of 2006 Madison County Subdivision Regulations) must be filed with the final plat. *II-H.2 and II-H.4. (a)-(c) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-611 MCA*
3. The final plat must be accompanied by a certification by a licensed title abstractor showing the owners of record, the names of any lienholders or claimants of record against the land, and the written consent to the subdivision from any lienholders or claimants of record against the land. *II-G(c) and Appendix K, MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-612, MCA*
4. All subdivision road and utility easements (or rights-of-way) shall be clearly shown and labeled on the final plat. *II-G and Appendix K, MCSR 9/2006; Uniform Standards for Final Subdivision Plats (8.94.30003, ARM); 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
5. Future modification of any elements shown on the plat may not be made without County review and approval. *IV-A.14 and 19, MCSR 9/2006; Section 27-30-101, MCA*

[Specific subdivision conditions]

6. The final plat shall include a statement whereby lot owners waive their right to protest any rural improvement district (RID) designated by the Madison County to protect public health and safety on public roads leading to the subdivision. *IV-A 9 (a)–(h) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-608 MCA*
7. Prior to final plat approval, temporary physical addresses must be assigned to each lot in accordance with Madison County’s rural addressing and Emergency 911 system. *IV-A 9 (k-2) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-608 MCA*
8. Upon completion of road improvements and prior to building construction, a permanent address shall be assigned to each building site. Individual address signs shall be erected at the driveway entrances. *IV-A 9 (k-2) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-608 MCA*
9. In the event that the road, utilities or other required improvements are not completed prior to final plat submission, an Improvements Agreement and irrevocable Letter of Credit or equivalent guarantee shall be filed with the Board of County Commissioners prior to final plat approval. The amount of the letter of credit shall be 125% of the engineer’s estimated cost for the improvements. Any letter of credit or other guarantee must cover the time period needed to complete project improvements. *IV-A 14 (c-2) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-608 MCA*
10. A condominium site plan showing building setbacks and parking areas shall accompany the final plat, and the County Planning Office shall serve as the repository for the plan. *IV-B 6 (e-2) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
11. A building envelope plan for all subdivision lots shall accompany the final plat. Changes to proposed building envelopes shall require County review and approval. The face of the final plat shall reference the building envelope plan. Building practices and building locations (including driveway routes) shall conform to the recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical investigation. *IV-A 6 and IV-B 8 MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
12. Prior to final plat approval, the developer shall submit to the County and the Montana State Historic Preservation Office (MT SHPO) the most recent cultural resource

inventory report for the Blixseth Site (24MA1777), as originally identified in the 1999 YMC Cultural Resource Survey. *IV-A 22 MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*

13. Prior to final plat approval, proposed road names and temporary addresses shall be submitted to and approved by Madison County Planning. *IV-A 9 (k-2) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
14. Prior to final plat approval, the developer shall provide a written and signed report from a registered professional engineer verifying the requested subdivision road deviations (subdivision application, p. IV 11-12) are in accordance with AASHTO guidelines. *IV-A 10(a) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-505(1)(e), 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*

[ODP-specific conditions]

1. Provide evidence of mutual aid cooperation with the GCCRFD. *IV-A 14(c) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
2. Provide an updated status report on the overall development, including a list of all subdivisions approved and number of lots and units involved. *II-C 4(f) MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
3. Participate with other Big Sky area developers in a Madison county led study to address traffic safety issues on US 191 and MT 64 and connecting roads. *II-E 2 (b-1), IV-A 9 MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
4. Submit a subdivision specific geotechnical assessment with each preliminary plat application. *IV-A 3 and 21 MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*
5. Submit a subdivision specific evaluation with each preliminary plat application of anticipated impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat as well as evidence of current and proposed steps taken to limit impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat. *IV-20 MCSR 9/2006; 76-3-504 and 76-3-608, MCA*

[ODP-Specific Notes]

1. Regarding traffic safety, at some point it may become necessary for Madison County, in response to public safety concerns, to deny subdivision applications in the Big Sky are, including but not limited to YMC, until traffic safety improvements have been made.

MOTION: To approve the Overall Development Plan amendment as recommended by staff and modifying ODP-specific condition #1 by changing the word “agreement” to “cooperation.” Moved by David Maddison, seconded by Don Loyd. Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: To approve the preliminary plat for The Settlement as recommended by staff, including the modification to Condition #12 and the new condition #14. Moved by David Maddison, seconded by Kathy Looney. Motion passed with one nay vote by Pat Bradley.

B. Variance Request – Modified Cul-de-Sac Design for Foxtail Pine Road in Yellowstone Mountain Club

Proposed: Alter configuration of the Foxtail Pine Road cul-de-sac from a circular cul-de-sac to a Y-type cul-de-sac.

Foxtail Pine Road is approximately 1.9 miles in length and located within a 60-foot access and utility easement which terminates in a 50-foot radius easement at the end of the road. The original road design was approved as part of the final plat for the Yellowstone Mountain Club (YMC) Phase 3A subdivision in January 2006. Foxtail Pine Road connects to Yellowstone Mountain Club Trail and provides access to the northwest section of the Yellowstone Mountain Club holdings. A separate emergency access road connects the end of Foxtail Pine Road with the adjacent YMC Phase 1 and 2 subdivisions, as shown in final plat attached to the variance application.

PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the staff analysis and proposed Findings of Fact, the Planning Board recommended approval with no additional conditions of the requested variance. The altered cul-de-sac design will have no significant negative impacts on the subdivision.

MOTION: To approve the variance to allow a modified cul-de-sac design for Foxtail Pine Road as recommended by staff. Moved by David Maddison, seconded by Kathy Looney. Motion passed unanimously.

Public hearing adjourned: 8:05 pm

- VII. Subdivision Regulations – Modifications to Definitions** - Consider amending the Definitions in the Subdivision Regulations and possibly set a hearing date for considering the changes.

Charity Fechter presented the proposed subdivision definitions for Planning Board consideration. Planning Board members asked several questions and offered several wording changes to clarify the meaning. C. Fechter supported to the proposed amendments and recommended a Planning Board Hearing on the proposed definitions be scheduled for May 27, 2008.

VIII. Old Business

- A. Streamside Protection Regulations, Jim Jarvis gave a status report on the steering committee's activities. Charity Fechter noted that a facilitator is still being considered. Lane Adamson gave some background insight on streamside setbacks.
- B. Airport Affected Area Regulations, Charity Fechter gave a status report on the project. C. Fechter has made extensive updates to the proposal and sent them to Rick Donaldson for comment. Don Loyd, on behalf of the Planning Board, will also review and comment on the proposal. A letter from Jeff Laszlo regarding the proposed extension of the Ennis airport runway was discussed.

- C. Other - none

IX. New Business

- A. Planning Board Member Reports
 - Pat Bradley brought two articles related to conservation easements. One mentioned a "perpetual" easement in Johnson County, Wyoming, that was removed by the county after 9 years. The second article came from High Country News and mentioned the Colorado program is being subjected to appraisers inflating values.

- Ann discussed the water policy legislation being discussed in Helena, and the assumption that the development in rural areas is not of great concern.

B. Site Visits

- i. Ruby Rock – April 17
- ii. Rancho Vista Verde – April 17

C. Planning Office Report

Charity commented that the joint meeting on March 14 was very well-received. A meeting summary is included in the packet.

D. Other

Dave Maddison expressed the importance of the Planning Board making decisions based on strong scientific information, especially relating to water and wastewater impacts of subdivisions. Ann Schwend expressed concern about the impacts of small wells and septic systems and the difficulty of monitoring their cumulative impacts on the environment. Pat Bradley spoke about the benefits of citizen-initiated zoning.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.